

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 43-68 have been cancelled. New claims 69-78 have been added. Claims 1-42 were previously cancelled. Hence, claims 69-78 are pending. Support for the newly added claims can be found in the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on December 13, 2006. During the interview, Applicant' attorney Daniel Mao discussed with the Examiner regarding claim 43. Specifically, Applicant' attorney pointed out to the Examiner that Kastenholz et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0007946) does not disclose the claimed relationship between a circuit card and a transfer card, or between an interface card and a switched network card. Additionally, Applicants' attorney discussed with the Examiner the various types of cards and the specification of the present application. In response, the Examiner suggested Applicant to amend the claims in a formal response.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action mailed October 18, 2006, claims 43-45, 57, 60-62, and 64-67 were objected to because of certain informality. In order to expedite prosecution of the above identified application, claims 43-45, 57, 60-62, and 64-67 have been cancelled without prejudice in any manner.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action mailed October 18, 2006, claims 43-49 and 51-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kastenholz et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0007946). Additionally, claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kastenholz et al. in view of Gorshe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,667,973). Applicant respectfully traverses all these rejections. But in order to

expedite prosecution of the above identified application, claims 43-68 have been cancelled without prejudice in any manner.

New Claims

New claims 69-78 have been added. Among them, claims 69 and 72 are independent claims. Kastenholtz et al. and Gorshe et al., do not, alone or in combination, teach or suggest one or more claim limitations.

With respect to claim 69, Kastenholtz et al. and Gorshe et al., do not appear, alone or in combination, to disclose at least

a first transfer card coupled to the first circuit card through at least a first base card and a first backplane, the first base card being coupled directly to both the first transfer card and the first backplane, the first base card being neither a part of the first transfer card nor a part of the first backplane, the first transfer card not being a part of the first circuit card, the first circuit card not being a part of the first transfer card...

a second transfer card coupled to the second circuit card through at least a second base card and a second backplane, the second base card being coupled directly to both the second transfer card and the second backplane, the second base card being neither a part of the second transfer card nor a part of the second backplane, the second transfer card not being a part of the second circuit card, the second circuit card not being a part of the second transfer card...

a first interface card coupled to the first switched network card through at least a third base card and a third backplane, the third base card being coupled directly to both the first interface card and the third backplane, the third base card being neither a part of the first interface card nor a part of the third backplane, the first interface card not being a part of the first switched network card, the first switched network card not being a part of the first interface card, the third backplane and the first backplane being associated with different physical locations...

Hence claim 69 is allowable for at least the above reasons. Additionally, claims 70 and 71 are allowable for substantially the same reason as claim 69, and more particularly for the specific features they recite.

With respect to claim 72, Kastenholz et al. and Gorshe et al., do not appear, alone or in combination, to disclose at least

a first transfer card coupled to the first circuit card through at least a first backplane, the first transfer card not being a part of the first circuit card, the first circuit card not being a part of the first transfer card...

a second transfer card coupled to the second circuit card through at least a second backplane, the second transfer card not being a part of the second circuit card, the second circuit card not being a part of the second transfer card...

a first interface card coupled to the first switched network card through at least a third backplane, the third backplane and the first backplane being associated with different physical locations, the first interface card not being a part of the first switched network card, the first switched network card not being a part of the first interface card...

Hence claim 72 is allowable for at least the above reasons. Additionally, claims 73-78 are allowable for substantially the same reason as claim 72, and more particularly for the specific features they recite.

Specification

The specification has been amended by adding the priority claim that has been made and accepted by the Patent Office. No new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Appl. No. 09/827,127
Amdt. dated March 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2006

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Daniel Mao".

Daniel Mao
Reg. No. 51,995

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
DM:ejt
61004072 v3